

Remarks/Arguments

Claims presently pending herein, before any action on this amendment, are claims 1, 2, 5-12 and 14-26. On entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection, the pending claims will be cancelled and the new pending claims will be claims 27-37, which are believed to be allowable for reasons set forth below.

Neither the Donley, the Blanchet-Fincher nor the Gower references disclose nor suggest the invention claimed herein, singly or in combination. The Donley reference pertains to providing a thin lubricious film on a substrate. In the proposed new method claim 27, the invention includes the steps of directing light of a wavelength in the infrared region which is resonant with a vibrational mode at a target starting material, vaporizing the target material without decomposing it, and depositing the vaporized material on a substrate in solid form that is essentially same chemically as the starting target material. As should be apparent, the Donley reference does not disclose none of the steps claimed herein. Although the Donley reference does disclose that the produced thin films have the same chemical composition as the target, as at bottom of col. 2, it does not disclose how this is done. As noted in the specification, this invention is possible to carry out apparently because the starting material is maintained at ground level and is not elevated to the excited state where chemical change would take place through rupture of the bonds and possibly in other ways. This argument also applies to the Blanchet-Fincher reference in spite of the statement in the latter that the IR spectra of the ablated, spin coated and spray coated films were substantially identical, which appears in lines 50-52 of col. 5.

The final rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-21 and 14-26 over the Donley reference in view of the Blanchet-Fincher reference, or vice versa, optionally considering the Gower reference, is not

understood. It is not understood , inter alia, if the Gower reference is part of this rejection. If it is, then the Gower reference is not properly combinable with the Donley and the Blancet-Fincher references, being directed to a non-analogous art, i.e., drilling holes in electrical packages.

At bottom of p. 4 of the office action, the Examiner appears to indicate that the claim language is not as specific as it should be. If the Examiner has any suggestion pertaining to the use of more appropriate language, such suggestions will readily be considered.

It is requested that this amendment be entered into the record since it is believed that it places the case in condition for allowance, based on the interview held with the Examiner M. Padgett on Wednesday at 9:00 AM October 6, 2004, which is hereby acknowledged with appreciation. Entry of this amendment is necessary in order to render the case allowable and was not earlier presented due to the natural progression of prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,


George A. Kap

Reg. No. 22,898

Attorney for Applicants

Phone: (202)-404-1555